Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4

SUMMA RESOURCE HOLDINGS LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CARBON ENERGY LIMITED,

Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-05334-TEH

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On May 5, 2016, this Court dismissed the above-captioned action on the basis of forum non conveniens. Docket No. 37. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-9, a party may move for leave to file a motion for reconsideration under one of three categories. Here, Plaintiff files the instant motion based upon "a manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments" which were presented to the Court. See Civ. L.R. 7-9(b)(3). Plaintiff contends that the Court applied "an incorrect standard of deference" to its choice of forum in the Court's forum non conveniens analysis.

In its dismissal order, the Court considered and discussed the legal arguments raised by Plaintiff in connection with the instant motion. See Order at 6-7. The Court cited Carijano v. Occidental Petroleum Corp., 643 F.3d 1216 (9th Cir. 2011), which Plaintiff identifies in support of its contention that the Court applied an incorrect standard. Furthermore, the Court explained its reasoning for affording slightly less deference to Plaintiff's choice of forum in its forum non conveniens balancing analysis; therefore it clearly considered Plaintiff's argument. A motion for reconsideration is not the proper instrument for disagreement with the Court's analysis. See AF Holdings LLC v. Trinh, No. 12-CV-2392-CRB, 2012 WL 6087269, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2012).

Case 3:15-cv-05334-TEH Document 41 Filed 05/16/16 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California

Plaintiff has failed to show a manifest failure by the Court such that granting lear
to file a motion for reconsideration would be warranted. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion
for Leave to File a Motion for Reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 05/16/16

THELTON E. HENDERSON United States District Judge